UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,257	02/03/2004	Antonino Cattaneo	18396/2272	2419
29933 PALMER & D	7590 10/09/200 ODGE, LLP		EXAMINER	
KATHLEEN M		SIMS, JASON M		
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02199			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1631	
			<u></u>	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/771,257	CATTANEO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jason M. Sims	1631			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value of the provision of the provis	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron , cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2007.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-13 and 15-19</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14</u> is/are rejected.					
7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
		•			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments, filed 7/18/2007en fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Applicants have amended their claims, filed 7/18/2007refore rejections newly made in the instant office action have been necessitated by amendment.

Claims 1-13 and 15-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventive group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 9/18/2006.

Claim 14 is the current claim hereby under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments, filed 7/18/2007, with respect to the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 102 (e) has been fully considered and are persuasive because of applicant's amendment to the claim. Therefore the rejection has been withdrawn.

The following rejection has been necessitated by amendment and is newly applied:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 1631

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sliwkowski (US P/N 6,949,245).

The claims are directed to an intracellularly binding immunoglobulin molecule comprising: a variable heavy chain, which exhibits at least 85% homology to the consensus sequence SEQ ID No 3; and a variable light chain.

Sliwkowski teaches the limitations of claim 14 at col. 10, lines 15-21, col. 64, lines 58-67, col. 65-66 and col. 69. Sliwkowski at col. 10, defines an intact antibody as a molecule that is comprised of both heavy chain and light chain components. Sliwkowski at col. 64 further discusses antibodies used for therapy in colorectal cancer and references an antibody that comprises seq id no 6, which is a sequence with 93.6% homology to the claimed heavy chain in claim 14 of the instant patent application. Therefore, the antibody used that comprises seq id no 6, which is a consensus heavy chain, will also comprise a light chain by the definition of an antibody, which reads on a variable heavy chain which exhibits at least 93.6% homology to the consensus sequence SEQ ID No 3; and a variable light chain.

Sliwkowski does not explicity teach a variable heavy chain which exhibits at least 94% homology to the consensus sequence SEQ ID No 3.

Art Unit: 1631

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention that a variable heavy chain, which exhibits at least 93.6% homology to a sequence would also exhibit 94% homology to the same sequence as the difference in homologies is a mere 0.04%, which is a difference that is an obvious variation. When there is motivation to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In this instance the fact that a combination was obvious to try shows that it was obvious under § 103. It would have been obvious to try for one of ordinary skill in the art because it is common

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

practice to try to achieve greater homology with respect to this type of invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1631

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Sims, whose telephone number is (571)-272-7540.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached via telephone (571)-272-0720.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

// Jason Sims //

/Lori A. Clow/ Primary Examiner 20 September 2007